

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Bondary McCall,) C.A. No. 3:06-3235-TLW-JRM
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) ORDER
)
United States of America,)
)
Defendants.)
)

This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Joseph R. McCrorey, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In his Report, Magistrate Judge McCrorey recommends that this case be summarily dismissed without prejudice. (Doc. # 6). Plaintiff has filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 11).¹

In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections. . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and

¹Plaintiff has filed a document entitled “‘Within Admiralty’ By Special Visitation Motion for Order to show Cause Re: Contempt.” (Doc. # 11). Although filed outside of the objections time period, this Court has carefully considered this filing and determines that this document appears to “object” to the Report. Accordingly, this Court will consider the Report de novo and consider plaintiff’s filing as objections thereto.

Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F.Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of this standard, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections thereto. The Court accepts the Report.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 6), plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED** (Doc. # 11); and this case is summarily **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

May 4, 2007
Florence, South Carolina